DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 367 009 CS 508 464

AUTHOR Willmington, S. Clay; And Others
TITLE Meeting Communication Proficiency Requirements for Teacher Certification through the Basic Course.
PUB DATE Nov 93
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (79th, Miami Beach, FL, November 18-21, 1993). Best available copy.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication Skills; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; *Interpersonal Communication; Introductory Courses; Listening Skills; Speech Communication; State Standards; *Student Evaluation; Teacher Certification
IDENTIFIERS Professional Concerns; *University of Wisconsin Oshkosh

ABSTRACT

The Communication Department at the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh has made a direct response to the rule of the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction that teacher preparation institutions recommend students for certification only after they have demonstrated proficiency in speaking and listening. Proficiency is demonstrated by certain key tasks completed by students enrolled in Communication 96-111, "Fundamentals of Speech Communication." Assessment instruments were developed and are used to assess knowledge of communication principles and performance in public speaking, interpersonal communication, and listening. The instruments are continually tested for their validity and reliability. (Contains 13 references, a handout outlining the specific requirements for an informative speech, a public speaking rating form, an interpersonal skills rating form, and a list of questions to assess interpersonal communication.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 367 009

MEETING COMMUNICATION PROFICIENCY REQUIREMENTS FOR TEACHER CERTIFICATION THROUGH THE BASIC COURSE

By

S. Clay Willmington
Communication Department
U.W. Oshkosh
Oshkosh, WI 54901
(414) 424-4420

James A. Benson, U.W. Oshkosh
Kay E. Neal, U.W. Oshkosh
Milda M. Steinbrecher, U.W. Oshkosh

CS508404

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Clay Willmington

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

MEETING COMMUNICATION PROFICIENCY REQUIREMENTS FOR TEACHER CERTIFICATION THROUGH THE BASIC COURSE

INTRODUCTION

In the decade of the 1980's, education in the United States experienced unprecedented scrutiny and criticism. Many critics report serious shortcomings. For example, a U.S. Department of Labor report claims that in spite of efforts at improvement of schools during the 1980's, "students were performing essentially no better at the end of the decade than they were at the beginning." (U.S. Department of Labor, April, 1992).

Among the many responses designed to improve education is the strengthening of teacher education programs. Among the suggestions for improving teacher preparation is the suggestion that demonstrated communication proficiency should be a condition for licensure. Rubin and Feezel note that "abilities to carry on effective interpersonal relations with others, to speak clearly and concisely, to lead and interact in group environments, and to listen with understanding and empathy are most important for all teachers." (Rubin and Feezel, 1985). Professional groups who have recognized the need for effective communication skills by teachers even before the 80s include the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (1979), and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (1980). The latter organization identified "oral communication skills" as a skill which should be assessed for entry or continuance in a teacher education program in a resolution passed at its annual meeting in Dallas.

Unfortunately, general recognition of the importance of communication skills for teachers has not been translated into clearly defined communication education programs for teachers. A recent report by a subcommittee of the Committee on Assessment and Testing of the Speech Communication Association claims that "The actual requirement of competency in teacher education programs is at best unclear and inadequate." One of the conclusions of this subcommittee is that "Speech communication educators have not developed a clear and consistent procedure for assessing oral communication abilities" (DeWitt, Bozik, Hay, Litterst, Strohkirch, & Yokum, 1991).

The Communication Department at the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh directly addressed the concerns expressed by the subcommittee, both by developing clear statements of oral communication proficiency for teachers and by valid and reliable procedures for assessment. This report explains how this was accomplished.

INITIAL PLANNING

Effective on January 1, 1987, the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction adopted a rule stating that all institutions which offer professional education programs leading to certification must submit to the Department for approval, written evidence that their programs comply with the requirements of Chapter PI4. The critical section of the chapter was PI4.06(6)(a) 2 which required "Demonstrated proficiency in speaking and

listening as determined by the institution" (Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 1987).

Although the College of Education and Human Services at UW-Oshkosh has a long-standing requirement that their students take the basic speech communication course (96-111), the appearance of this rule, as stated, caused those of us in the Communication Department to stop and reflect upon the question of whether we were satisfied with our students' "demonstrated proficiency." Up until this point, each instructor was responsible for developing his/her own course with no attempt to identify in specific terms the proficiencies expected in all sections of the course.

As a result of this requirement, it was an appropriate time to get the 96-111 staff together to decide how to define "proficiency in speaking and listening," methods for obtaining it, and procedures for assessing student performance so we could attest to proficiency. With the support of an institutional grant, the staff worked on the development of the course for several weeks during the summer of 1988 to address these questions.

The first overall question addressed was "What does the proficient communicator know and do?" After deciding that the proficient communicator must demonstrate proficiency as a public speaker, as an interpersonal communicator, and as a listener, we broke into three committees to write definitions of proficiency in these three areas. The outcome was a list of elements of proficiency in each area: nineteen in public speaking; eight in

interpersonal communication; and five in listening. Then, each element was categorized according to how to assess it, either by a pencil and paper test or by oral performance.

ASSESSING COGNITIVE PROFICIENCY

Most theorists agree that the proficient communicator is able to demonstrate both cognitive and behavioral skills. Wiemann and Backlund, for example, argue that both non-behavioral (cognitive) aspects of the communication process and specific references to actual communication behavior are necessary for a complete understanding of the communication behavior of individuals. (Wiemann & Backlund, 1980)

Because we concurred that knowledge of the basic principles of communication is an essential part of communication proficiency, we began the task of developing an instrument to assess this knowledge. Cognitive proficiency is properly and most efficiently measured by a pencil and paper test. Thus, faculty committees proceeded to develop questions to assess various areas of knowledge within communication. This effort resulted in an initial pool of several hundred questions. The next step was to evaluate the questions that were submitted and to construct banks of questions that contained questions addressing each proficiency. A panel of three evaluators - one from each proficiency area team - was appointed to evaluate the original pool of questions. For a question to be deemed acceptable, it was agreed that the wording of the question stem

and each answer option must meet the approval of each panel member. Criteria elaborated by Ebel were used to assess questions: wording must express ideas clearly; questions must contain words with precise meanings; complex or awkward word arrangement is avoided; nonessential specificity is to be avoided; the level of wording difficulty must be appropriate for the intended group; irrelevant clues to the correct response must be avoided; and stereotyped phraseology is to be avoided. (Ebel, 1963) Problem questions were repaired when possible, or were discarded.

Four test banks, each consisting of 60 multiple-choice questions, were constructed. The determination of the number of questions in the test banks dealing with a particular proficiency area was based upon two factors: the amount of space devoted to the topic in the textbook used for the course and the amount of time devoted to the topic in the teaching of a typical section of the course. This is consistent with the advice of Lindquist. (Lindquist, 1963)

The four test banks were administered to sections of the basic course during fall 1988. Item analysis was performed on the questions to check for their ability to discriminate and for their difficulty level. The discrimination measure examines whether persons who have high overall scores on the test select the correct answer to a question more frequently than do persons who have low scores. Questions found to discriminate inadequately were given to the appropriate proficiency team for

revision.

A second measure of question quality was the difficulty level of the question (e.g., "What percentage of the subjects are able to answer the question correctly?"). Questions answered correctly less than 30% of the time (too difficult) or correctly more than 70% of the time (too easy) were given to the appropriate proficiency team for repair.

The final product was four equivalent test banks, each containing 60 five-option multiple-choice questions. Administration of the test banks to all sections of the 96-111 sections in the fall of 1988 and the spring of 1989 enabled us to establish initial norms for the banks. The mean score on the 60-item test banks was 43.5, with a standard deviation of 5.6. Using this data, we determined that a minimum score of 33 (two standard deviations below the mean), would be required to demonstrate cognitive proficiency.

A major revision of the tests was done by two faculty members in the summer of 1990 following the adoption of a new textbook for the course. This required adjusting the terminology to make questions consistent with the language in the textbook and the creation of some new questions dealing with aspects of proficiencies which were discussed in the newly-adopted textbook but which had not been presented in the previously-used textbook. The topics tested with the number of questions on each topic are as follows: communication theory-5; listening-7; speech purposes-2; topic selection-3; organization/speech body-7;

self-concept-3; perception-3; language-3; nonverbal-5; relationships-5; supporting material-4; introductions-3; conclusions-1; delivery-4; persuasion-3; and reasoning-2. These test banks were administered to approximately 60 sections of the course during the 1991-1992 academic year.

To assure that the cognitive paper and pencil measure is reliable and valid, on-going measurement of the ability of questions to discriminate and of the difficulty level of questions is required. In addition, norms need to be revised, as necessary.

ASSESSING PUBLIC SPEAKING PROFICIENCY

To measure proficiency in public speaking, it was necessary to develop one or more student tasks which would provide a means for the instructor to measure the student's skill against the characteristics enumerated in the proficiency profile. The initial goal was to design a single student public speaking performance which enables him/her to demonstrate the critical skills in the most efficient manner possible. On the surface, this appeared to be a relatively simple task, since all instructors who teach 96-111 require graded public speaking assignments. However, the nature of these speeches vary widely from instructor to instructor; there were no standardized speech assignments at the outset of this project. Since everyone assigned at least one informative speech, it was decided that the public speaking task would be an informative speech. To aid in

the standardization of this assignment, a one-page handout for students outlining the specific requirements for the speech was prepared by the public speaking committee. (See Appendix A)

It was also decided that, in addition to the informative speech, each instructor would, as a minimum, assign two other speeches. One of these would be a persuasive speech and the nature of the other speaking assignment would be left to the instructor's discretion. To avoid basing the assessment on only one performance, it was decided that to be deemed proficient in public speaking, a student must have a C average on these three speeches. A C- average does not meet proficiency requirements.

The next step was to develop a rating form to assess the public speaking skills described in the proficiency profile. The following traits were included in the form: introduction/ conclusion; speech purpose; message organization; supporting materials; audience adaptation; language/style, vocal usage; and physical elements.

We experimented with 3, 5, and 7-point evaluation scales measuring each of the eight skill areas. Our experiments determined that the items would be most effectively measured using a 5-point scale, with scores of 1 and 2 designating a lack of proficiency, 3 equaling a minimal expectation for proficiency, and 4 and 5 representing scores well above the minimal expectation for proficiency. We decided that if students averaged a 3 (minimally proficient) on the eight-item scale, for a total score of 24, we would deem them proficient as a public

speaker. (See Appendix B)

Since completing this project, differential weighting of individual items on the rating form has been discussed. Concern has been voiced that some of the individual items should be weighted more heavily than others. Further research will be done on this issue.

ASSESSING INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION PROFICIENCY

The question of how to define and assess interpersonal communication proficiency has received much attention from communication scholars in the past decade. We discovered that this scholarship posed more questions for us than it provided answers. After study and discussion of the subject, we identified seven areas of interpersonal behavior that we felt contributes to overall interpersonal communication proficiency. The seven areas are physical involvement, vocal usage, promoting interaction, language usage, listening, empathy, and self-disclosure. (See Appendix C)

When we began the project, the course and the textbook for the course focused almost exclusively on public speaking. Thus, it was necessary for the group to develop learning activities and strategies to teach interpersonal skills. Some of the instructors had never studied or taught this area of communication, so considerable staff development had to occur. We relied heavily on two instructors who also taught the interpersonal communication course to share ideas with the entire

staff on ways to teach interpersonal proficiency.

To assess interpersonal communication proficiency, we sought to develop a single student performance assignment that would enable him/her to demonstrate the various skills identified above in the most efficient manner possible. The final product was a structured interpersonal encounter of approximately five minutes. In this encounter, the instructor or a trained initiator, engages the student in a conversation in a rather spontaneous manner, but at the same time making sure that certain planned prompts are given during the conversation designed to allow the student to demonstrate, or fail to demonstrate, each of the seven interpersonal proficiency behaviors.

Some of the behaviors like physical involvement, vocal usage, and language usage are assessed throughout the encounter. Others require the use of a prompt. For example, to assess proficiency in promoting interaction, at some time during the course of the conversation, the initiator can pause and invite the student to introduce a subject that might be appropriate for the two of them to talk about for awhile. If the student is able to readily introduce a subject that relates to an interest or a viewpoint that has been communicated earlier by the initiator, the student can also be credited with listening or possibly empathy skills. Empathy is assessed by introducing a subject that allows the student to express an understanding of a feeling or a point of view different from their own. For example, non-Native American students can be invited to look at the use of

school mascot names seen as offensive by certain Native Americans. An empathic student may express his or her own personal feelings on a subject, but they should also be able to recognize feelings different from their own. The other two behaviors assessed are listening and self-disclosure. (See Appendix D)

The student is rated on a 1-5 point scale for each of the seven behaviors. He/she is deemed proficient if they score a total of 21 points which means they have to average a 3 rating for the seven behaviors.

ASSESSING LISTENING PROFICIENCY

The listening committee searched for a standardized listening test that we could employ to assess listening skills as we defined them. Of the commercial tests available, we decided that the Watson-Barker Listening Test (video) came closest to meeting our needs (Backlund, 1983; Rubin & Roberts, 1987; Rhodes, 1988). We recognized that the Watson-Barker might not be a perfect fit for our purposes. So two of our faculty members were encouraged to begin development of an instrument designed to assess listening skills taught in the course.

After three years in the making, the UW-Oshkosh Listening Test is now in place. It is on videotape, contains 55 questions, and takes 45 minutes to administer. Students are asked to respond to 13 separate messages or interactions seen on the video. Included are a four-minute speech, three brief

announcements, a set of directions, a description, five scenes involving two people, three statements using evidence, and three statements using reasoning.

Recognizing that understanding or comprehension is considered the primary purpose of listening, most of the questions, 38 out of the 55, test for this skill. But we also teach students to listen critically or evaluatively. Consequently, 12 of the questions test this skill. Finally, empathic listening is less often employed, but is still an important kind of listening. There are four questions testing emphatic listening. One question does not fit into any of the three categories.

EVALUATION OF THE PLAN

The typical response of communication departments to challenges from sources such as Colleges of Business, Education, or in our case, a state Department of Education, is to say, "Take our course. If you pass with a C or better, you're O.K." We note two major concerns with this simple and quick response.

First, bear in mind that the course projected as meeting the need was undoubtedly designed to address other perceived educational needs. Further, faculty members teaching the course have their own agendas and reasons for teaching the course a certain way. Consequently, they are unlikely to immediately scrap what they have been doing in favor of more directly addressing a new purpose of the course.

Second, we discovered that while our 86-111 staff included "communication proficiency" as a course goal, the course grade was an imperfect indication of student proficiency. Instructors assign grades based on several factors other than communication proficiency. Instructors typically include in their calculation of course grades such things as class attendance and participation, performance on quizzes, and completing work on time. Even if they don't recognize it, it's suspected that effort and improvement may figure into the evaluation. While possibly justified as considerations in student evaluation, these factors may relate very little to "communication proficiency" by any standard, thus calling into question the assumption that a course grade in a basic communication course is an accurate indicator of student proficiency.

A strength of the UW-Oshkosh plan is that we address communication proficiency as an essentially independent entity from the course grade. In this way we are confident that when we sign a speech proficiency form for a student for inclusion in their folder in the College of Education and Human Services, that the student has indeed demonstrated observable proficiency in communication as we define it.

Given the soundness of the idea of the plan, it should be evaluated by appropriate criteria for assessing any plan of assessment. The two most basic criteria are validity and reliability. We have given attention to both matters.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Validity

We have worked for validity by tying both the pencil and paper tests and the performance tests directly to the proficiency profiles we developed in answer to the question of what the proficient communicator should know and do. To the best of our ability, we constructed test profiles as a reflection of the knowledge and skills considered appropriate as found in communication literature and surveys (Willmington, 1986).

Validity of the pencil and paper test is seen by the inclusion of a certain number of questions pertaining to each of the 16 topics identified earlier in this manuscript. Validity of the performance tests in public speaking and interpersonal communication was promoted by the development of rating scales which insured proper attention to the eight traits mentioned earlier that we believe constitute proficiency. The number of questions on the listening test involving comprehension, evaluation, and empathy were determined according to what we believed to be representative of the portion of time those kinds of listening are employed.

Reliability

The reliability of our use of the various assessment instruments varies. The Kuder-Richardson #20 (KR20) test of reliability for the paper and pencil test averaged slightly above .7 for classes taking the test in 1991-92. The KR20 for the UWO Listening Test averages slightly below .7 for the year. Most

testing theorists would accept these reliabilities as satisfactory. We are satisfied with them while continuing to work for improvement.

The reliability of the public speaking and interpersonal performance tests are more difficult to determine. The whole staff assembles periodically to review videotapes of student performances, with each person rating independently and then comparing ratings. These sessions show us that interpersonal rating reliability is usually .7 or above. Surprisingly, the public speaking reliability has been lower, often around .5. We have noted that reliability quotients vary greatly among the factors evaluated. For example, the message organization factor correlates quite highly with overall ratings, while the use of supporting materials fails to show much correlation with overall ratings. We cannot calculate reliability scores for public speaking and interpersonal performances in the individual classrooms because there is only a single rating given by a single instructor.

CONCLUSION

The Communication Department at UW-Oshkosh has made a direct response to the rule of the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction that teacher preparation institutions recommend students for certification only after they have demonstrated proficiency in speaking and listening. Proficiency is demonstrated by certain key tasks completed by students enrolled

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

in Communication 96-111, "Fundamentals of Speech Communication." Assessment instruments have been developed and are used to assess knowledge of communication principles and performance in public speaking, interpersonal communication, and listening. The instruments are continually tested for their validity and reliability.

REFERENCES

AACTE Directory 1980. (1980). Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Backlund, P. (1983). Problems in assessing listening skills. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Speech Communication Association, Washington, D.C.

Ebel, R. (1963). Writing the test item. In Educational Measurement, E.F. Lindquist, ed. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

DeWitt, J., Bozik, M., Hay, E., Litterst, J., Strohkirch, S. & Yokum, C. (1991). Oral communication competency and teacher certification in the U.S.: Reality and recommendations. Communication Education, 40, 147-149.

Lindquist, E.F. (1963). Educational Measurement: Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Rhodes, S. (1988). Listening assessment and informal methods. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Central States Speech Association, Schaumberg, IL.

Rubin, R. & Feezel, J. (1985). Teacher communication competence: Essential skills and assessment procedures. Central States Speech Journal, 36, 2.

Rubin, R. & Roberts, C. (1987). A comparative examination and analysis of three listening tests. Communication Education, 36, 142-153.

Standards for Accreditation of Teacher Preparation. (1979). Washington, D.C.: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

U.S. Department of Labor (April, 1992). Learning a Living: A Blueprint for High Performance, 7.

Wiemann, J. & Backlund, P. (1980). Current theory and research in communicative competence. Review of Educational Research, 15, 187.

Willmington, C. (1986). Oral communication instruction for careers in business, nursing, and teaching. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the SCA, Chicago.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (1987). State of Wisconsin Teacher education program approval rules and certification standards, PI 4.06(6)(2)2. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction.

APPENDIX A

To demonstrate oral communication proficiency, you are to prepare a speech to inform which meets the following requirements:

1. Length: 5-7 minutes
2. A speech which is your original work. Use of a speech constructed by another is not allowed and will result in automatic failure in this performance.
3. A speech which attempt to provide your audience with new information or new understanding about a subject or consequence.
4. A speech which is presented extemporaneously; that is, one which has been carefully constructed and which has been practiced but not memorized until it can be presented fluently, with the use of a limited number of note cards. Important: reading of the speech from a manuscript or from note cards will not be acceptable.

Evaluator Expectations for Speech Content:

1. Develop an effective introduction to your speech which
   a. Arouses interest in the topic.
   b. Suggests why knowledge about the topic may be of importance to the speaker and the listener.
   c. Identifies your speech topic and focus in a clear purpose statement.
   d. Identifies main points to be covered in the body of the speech.
2. Develop an effective speech body:
   a. Main ideas are clearly identified by the use of such techniques as parallel wording, internal summaries and transitions.
   b. Ideas are organized effectively, using a suitable arrangement pattern for a speech to inform.
   c. Supporting materials from at least 3 different quality (non-personal) sources are to be used and you should site the sources as you use the material. You may use appropriate personal experience as additional support.
   d. Visual aids may be used to increase the effective communication of your information (they are optional). If used, they are expected to be:
      1) Purposefully selected and used
      2) Neat, attractive and large enough
      3) Well-timed (shown only when discussing them)
      4) Effectively positioned and well-handled (all can see them; they don't distract from delivery)
   e. Adapt speech to the audience, which will consist of a UW-Oshkosh Communication Dept. faculty member. If given in 96-111, classmates will also be present.
3. Develop a conclusion which effectively reinforces thesis.

Evaluator Expectations for Delivery:

1. Use an extemporaneous speaking style
2. Use effective eye contact
3. Demonstrate effective posture
4. Use effective gestures
5. Demonstrate effective vocal presentation: sufficient vocal enthusiasm, vocal variety (pitch, rate, force), adequate volume, clear articulation, correct grammar, and avoidance of vocal clutter (vocal fillers, pauses, etc.)

APPENDIX B

PUBLIC SPEAKING RATING FORM

Speaker Name_____Rater Name_____Score_____

Circle the single best response for each factor.

1. Introduction/Conclusion - Clearly develops an appropriate introduction and conclusion.

1	2	3	4	5
Seriously Deficient	Deficient	Minimally Proficient	Clearly Proficient	Highly Proficient

2. Speech Purpose - Speech clearly addresses the assigned purpose.

1	2	3	4	5

3. Message Organization - Uses a clear and appropriate organizational pattern, uses appropriate transitions.

1	2	3	4	5

4. Supporting Materials - Uses and cites sources of materials to inform or persuade to achieve purpose.

1	2	3	4	5

5. Audience Adaptation - Message is adapted to the audience.

1	2	3	4	5

6. Language/Style - Appropriate (avoid excessive use of slang, profanity), clear, correct grammar.

1	2	3	4	5

7. Vocal Usage - Expressive, varied, fluent, avoid excessive vocalized pauses/fillers; appropriate volume, rate, clear articulation; correct pronunciation; suitable vocal quality.

1	2	3	4	5

8. Physical Elements - Effective eye contact; posture, gestures, and/or movement used purposefully; sufficiently poised.

1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX C

INTERPERSONAL SKILLS RATING FORM

Speaker Name_____Rater Name_____Score_____

Circle the single best response for each factor.

1. Physical Involvement - Uses eye contact, facial expression, appropriate posture, gesture, and poise.

1	2	3	4	5
Seriously Deficient	Deficient	Minimally Proficient	Clearly Proficient	Highly Proficient

2. Vocal Usage - Expressive, varied; fluent, avoids excessive vocalized pauses and fillers; appropriate volume, rate; clear articulation; correct pronunciation; suitable vocal quality.

1	2	3	4	5

3. Promoting Interaction - Initiates, sustains interaction; gives appropriate responses; shares conversation involvement.

1	2	3	4	5

4. Language Usage - Appropriate (avoids excessive use of slang, profanity), clear, correct.

1	2	3	4	5

5. Listening - Listens carefully; gives appropriate feedback (picks up topic after interruption and able to summarize main topics).

1	2	3	4	5

6. Empathy - Responses who sensitivity to the ideas and feelings of others.

1	2	3	4	5

7. Self Disclosure - Gives appropriate amount and type of information about self.

1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX D

INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION ENCOUNTER WITH UW-OSHKOSH FUNDAMENTALS STUDENTS

1. "Hi _____. Your information card tells me _____. Can you tell me any more about that hobby, major, hometown, or previous communication course/s.

2. This has now become a required course. How do you feel about that?

3. You've just finished your Informative Speech and I'd like to talk with you about it for just a few minutes.
   a. Why did you select the particular topic?
   b. Why did you think this was important information for the audience?
   c. When you thought about the people listening to the speech, did you adapt your speech in any way to the audience?
      1) If not, then why not?
      2) If so, how? (Follow up)
   d. When you think about preparing a speech and giving a speech, what was the most enjoyable (satisfying? easy?) part of the exercise for you?

      What was the least enjoyable? (most frustrating? difficult?)

4. This may be the first time you can vote for President.
   a. Are you planning to vote?
   b. Do you feel voting is important? Why? or Why not?

5. Let me ask you about a sensitive issue that's in the news right now: School age children that have contracted AIDS.
   a. Some communities are trying to keep these students from attending school. How do you feel about this?
   b. Well, what about the fears of parents with healthy children? Do you think their concerns are legitimate?

6. I've been promoting the conversation so far. In the short time we have left, what is one thing (about class or college) that you'd like to talk about?

7. If someone were to ask you to identify the major topics we've talked about today, what would you say?

8. Well, I've enjoyed taking with you..."